

REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1, 2 and 22 remain pending.

Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the reasons set forth on pages 2-5 of the Office Action.

Essentially, objections to two alleged informalities are repeated for each of claims 23-25.

These claims have been canceled and their subject matter added to independent claims 1, 2 and 22, respectively. The first informality alleged in the Office Action, however, is present in neither former claim 23 nor in claim 1, as amended to include the limitations of claim 23. Specifically, the recitation “in parallel with the storing” was removed in the amendment filed February 1, 2008. With regard to the second informality alleged in the Office Action, the amendment to claim 23 corrects the inadvertent error noted by the Examiner. Similar amendments where necessary, have been made to claims 2 and 22, such that neither of the alleged informalities is present in the amended claims.

Claims 1, 2 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maurer III, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0065780 (Maurer) in view of Marshall et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0135478 (Marshall). As noted above, claims 1, 2 and 22 have been added to include the subject matter of claims 23-25, respectively. Accordingly, this rejection is moot, although the Applicants incorporate by reference the remarks filed in previous replies.

Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maurer in view of Marshall and Janssen, U.S. Patent Publication

No. 2003/0163510 (Janssen). With the addition of the subject matter of claims 23-25 to independent claims 1, 2 and 22, respectively, the following remarks are directed to the features that distinguish the amended claims from Janssen, which is cited against those limitations.

At the outset, the Applicants note that the rejection of the substantial limitations set forth in claims 23-25 is supported in the Office Action by a single paragraph ([0008]) and a brief reference to Fig. 3 of Janssen. Paragraph [0008] is so brief as to be easily reproduced below:

The method of administering user access to application programs on a computer system comprises providing a user database, a database of tasks and a user-specific list of allowed tasks, comprising allowed application programs, configuring the list of allowed tasks on the basis of the user database and the database of tasks, detecting a command to execute a task, and preventing execution of tasks that are not on the list of allowed tasks.

Fig. 3, according to the publication “shows an action diagram illustrating how the invention is used to determine whether a task should be executed.”

In summary, then, Janssen is applied as teaching that the invention determines whether a task should be executed by preparing a user-specific list of allowed tasks, comprising allowed application programs, such that the list of allowed tasks is configured on the basis of a user database and a database of tasks. Thus, in response to a command to execute a task, Janssen prevents execution of tasks that are not on the list of allowed tasks. See also page 14 of the Office Action, in which the relevance of Janssen’s Fig. 3 is asserted to be “Compare to List, always terminate, terminate task.”

Accordingly, it is clear that Janssen is applied, in combination with Maurer and Marshall (which are asserted not to teach these limitations; Office Action at

pages 13-14) with respect to these limitations, citing only paragraph [0008] and Fig. 3.

However, the present invention, as defined in amended claim 1, 2 and 22, determines whether access to the first database in a replica operation mode is allowed for the program seeking the access, based on the condition of a replica operation of the first database. Further, if it is determined that access to the first database in a replica operation mode is allowed for the program, access to the first database is executed in the replica operation mode in parallel with the accessing of the program to the second database, but if it is determined that access to the first database in a replica operation mode is not allowed for the program, an error is caused and access is disabled to the first database.

The claims continue, defining that the replica operation mode is a mode in which the program access allowance has been switched from the first database to the second database, the step of determining whether access to the first database in a replica operation mode is allowed includes a step of reading a dynamic access allowance flag from a table using the name of the program seeking the access as a key, and the access allowance flag indicates whether access to the first database is allowed for the program seeking the access. Accordingly, the present invention dynamically allows access by the program to the first database, while Janssen previously stores the tasks allowed to a list and allows access based on the contents of the list, thereby fixing the allowed tasks to the list, and thereby the access allowance is static.

Therefore, the combination of Maurer, Marshall and Janssen, however motivated, does not raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the amended claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. 500.43519X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

/Daniel J. Stanger/
Daniel J. Stanger
Registration No. 32,846

DJS/sdb
(703) 684-1120